

to it so that these cutbacks in funding levels produce a leaner and more effective set of programs.

I am convinced that with better management and more cost-consciousness, these cuts can be absorbed without major harm to our overseas interests.

We have allowed the Administration a great deal of management flexibility to make these program changes.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman for the responsible bill he has brought to the floor and urge its adoption.

THE AMERICAN WORKER

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Boeing Corp. needs profits. So guess what? Boeing will get rid of 12,000 workers. That is right. The new American economy: Companies need profits, companies get rid of American workers, companies make more money, Government says, companies are strong, Government says the economy is improving.

Beam me up. In the words of Larry, Moe, and Curly, thank God for Ronald McDonald, ladies and gentlemen. These companies are lean and mean all right, but the problem is the American workers have liens on their homes, without means to pay the mortgages.

Where do we go from here? Four fifty an hour. Congress, Ronald McDonald does not have enough jobs to take care of the American workers' problems in this country. Congress better take a look at this new economy because there is not a job left. I only pray to God that these companies do not have a record year; do you know what I mean?

□ 1015

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM MEASURES

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of lopsided elections that allow politicians to return to office year after year regardless of their performance. The overwhelming reelection advantages of incumbents have left many American voters feeling that entrenched politicians are rarely held accountable to those they represent.

Many frustrated Americans have identified term limits as a way of bringing Government closer to the people, but the term limits movement has been put on hold after its defeat in the House and the Supreme Court decision handed down this week.

If the 104th Congress wants to address the heart of the public's concerns, we must adopt real campaign finance reform that improves the competitiveness of congressional races.

Today, I am reintroducing a series of bills designed to level the playing field between incumbent and challenger. My four bills would reduce the influence of special interest PAC's, ban leadership PAC's, reinstate the tax credit for in-State contributors, and require that residents of a candidate's district account for a clear majority of the candidate's contributions.

If my colleagues want to restore public confidence in the election process, improve membership turnover, and ensure elected representatives are held more accountable to their constituents. I invite them to join me in co-sponsoring these campaign finance reform measures.

ETHICS COMMITTEE ACTION LOOKS LIKE A POLITICAL COVERUP

(Mr. POMEROY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, when ethics charges are filed against a Member, the public has the right to have the absolute assurance that the charges are investigated and appropriate action taken. Appropriate action, as I see it, could even include dismissal of the charges and sanctions against those who filed the charges if they were found to be frivolous and malicious.

I, therefore, cannot understand why the Ethics Committee, on a party line vote, rejected the call for an outside counsel to investigate the charges currently pending against the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH. If the charges are frivolous, no action could dispel the stigma which presently exists more clearly. If the charges are serious, then each of us, regardless of party, ought to support the appropriate handling of them.

In the meantime, the public is thinking, I believe, if there is nothing to hide, what is the problem with an outside counsel. Instead, the Ethics Committee action to date begins to look like a political coverup of serious charges. We will not restore confidence in Government if this troubling problem continues to exist.

MEMBERS URGED TO SUPPORT THE AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House today is scheduled to continue our work on the American Overseas Interests Act—a bill designed to reform and reorganize and downsize our Nation's foreign affairs operations so that we can better serve our international interests in the years ahead.

This bill cuts foreign aid spending by \$3 billion over 2 years and \$21 billion over 7 years, while serving our national security needs and international economic interests, and providing humanitarian assistance for people who have been hit by disaster and cannot provide for themselves.

By maintaining support for the Camp David accords, we are signaling the opponents of peace in the Middle East as well as radical fundamentalists working to undermine other countries in the Middle East that are friendly to the United States, that our resolve to stay the course remains firm.

Our international relations measure punishes our adversaries by cutting off aid to countries that provide weapons to terrorist states and that consistently vote against us in the United Nations.

It is a sound bill, in the interests of Government reform. I urge my colleagues to support it.

A 1988 QUOTATION BY THE CURRENT SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain why the Speaker's alleged ethics violations require a full and thorough investigation.

But, I do not think I can say anything original.

Someone already said it best 7 years ago here on the House floor.

Let me first read the quote from 1988, and then you guess who said it.

I quote:

The rules normally applied by the Ethics Committee to an investigation of a typical Member are insufficient in an investigation of the Speaker of the House * * * the second-most powerful elected position in America. Clearly this investigation has to meet a higher standard of public accountability * * * the integrity of the House is at stake.

OK—who said it? Sound familiar?

Well, here is a hint—he is from Georgia.

And, he has got a big office.

Yes, the speaker of that quote is the current Speaker of the House: Congressman NEWT GINGRICH.

Well, here is a chance for the Speaker to put his money where his mouth is—or, at least, where it was.

Simply ask your hand-picked Ethics Committee to select an outside counsel with broad powers, just as you wanted in 1988.

The moral is this: You have to live by the words you speak, even when you are the Speaker.

EIGHTY-ONE PERCENT OF AMERICANS WANT DRAMATIC CUTS IN FOREIGN AID

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, while the liberal Democrats are attacking the Speaker of the House, we are going to go on and change the government because the people last November demanded change. They want changes in foreign aid. The liberal establishment here in Washington is not real fond of change. They do not approve of things like balanced budgets or fiscal responsibility. For years, now, liberals and Washington bureaucrats have made piles of money of the American taxpayer.

Last November, Americans clearly rejected the status quo here in Washington. They rejected deficit spending, and they told Congress to balance their budget and end the bureaucratic spending spree.

This week, Congress will have a chance to make some fundamental changes in our foreign assistance programs. We will scale back foreign aid and eliminate wasteful agencies. Clearly this is an opportunity to dramatically restructure international involvement, making it more accountable to the American taxpayers and more responsive to American interests.

Less than 10 percent cut this year in foreign aid. That is disgraceful. It is not even hors d'oeuvres. Placing AID under the State Department is like giving your mother to the post office. This bill needs work. Eighty-one percent of the American people want dramatic cuts in foreign aid, and we have not done it. This bill is just the beginning. When it goes to conference, this bill needs tremendous cuts.

PLEASE DO NOT CUT FUNDING FOR EDUCATION: IT IS AMERICA'S FUTURE

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to object to the budget put forth by the majority Republicans as it relates to education cuts. The majority Republicans have been saying for the past few weeks that their budget is one for the children of America.

Honestly, Mr. Speaker, their drastic budget cut slams the door in the face of our children. Many young people today see education as their only way to become part of the middle class, and they are right. If we cut title I funding, if we cut bilingual funding, if we cut national service assistance, if we cut student loans, if we cut job training, where are they going to get the education and training they need to earn a decent income and become taxpaying citizens?

It does not save taxes next century by cutting education today. Our children will not have a job in the next century to pay taxes if they do not have access to a good education today.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned about the elimination of bilin-

gual education in the Republican budget. These two children in this picture are from the Love Elementary School in the Heights area of Houston. Love has an incredible success rate in the bilingual program at their school. The children are learning English, they are excelling in their studies, and the program works. The students are continuing into junior and senior high. But, they will not if we pass the Republican budget because it cuts education funding.

CHINA SHOULD NOT HAVE MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that when we are gone, the administration will announce they are going to give China MFN. We should know several things: one, persecution has increased. Catholic priests have been arrested; on Easter Monday a Catholic priest was taken away. On Maundy Thursday they raided a house church. Violations of human rights have increased. The Gulags have increased. Most of the people watching this today are wearing clothing made perhaps in Gulags, but since that time, we have found out two additional things. We now know conclusively that they are shooting 25-year-old men and taking their kidneys and selling them for \$25,000. We have conclusive proof. I urge anyone who wants to see it to come to my office and I will show them.

The, last week, we found out in Chinese hospitals they are selling aborted fetuses, aborted babies, for food to eat. When this Congress has an opportunity to vote on MFN, I ask Members to think in terms, do they want to give a country like that MFN when they are selling aborted babies for eating and killing people for kidney transplants? These are the things that the Nazis did, and we would never give MFN to Nazi Germany.

REPUBLICANS SHOULD NOT CUT THE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

(Mr. OLVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the Republican budget. I have seen the charts and the graphs. I have seen the Republicans cut student loans with one hand to give a huge tax cut to the wealthiest Americans with the other hand.

Carissa Guertin of Fitchburg State College in Massachusetts has seen it, too. She says student loan cuts might take her out of college. Carissa writes, and I quote:

I am the first in my family to actually go to college. Without student aid, I will be forced to quit college and try to get a job without a degree. This may cause me to add

to the growing number of welfare recipients. I might have to become one. I do not see how student aid cuts will help our economy at all in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Carissa.

A FRIENDLY WAGER: THE HOUSTON ROCKETS VERSUS THE SPURS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I fought against student loan cuts, but today I ask for a moment of personal privilege. As spring proceeds, Mr. Speaker, many say that the hearts of Americans turn to the boys of summer. Mr. Speaker, the hearts of Texans turn to the boys of the B-ball; that is basketball.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, who I understand is from San Antonio, a friendly wager is in order. That is that the Houston Rockets will take this series in 7. I wonder, does the Speaker have the right stuff to accept this wager, the loser having to provide reasonable penalty for the loss to our respective constituents. I wonder, does he have the right stuff to accept this wager?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). If the gentlewoman will yield, I thank her, and I would like to say I accept the challenge with great enthusiasm, and I am sure that my fellow Texan shares the pride that we all have in our State in watching two Texas teams battle it out to represent the West in the NBA finals.

I, as a Spurs ticket holder for many years, will be rooting with my heart and soul for the San Antonio Spurs, and I know the gentlewoman will be doing the same for the Houston Rockets, but regardless of who wins, I am sure that she shares my pride in knowing that there will be a Texas team represented in the NBA finals.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. We are on, Mr. Speaker.

FOREIGN AID

(Mrs. WALDHOLTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, speaking as a jazz fan, wait until next year. But today, we will continue debating the American Overseas Act. This act takes bold steps to downsize the Federal bureaucracy, and at the same time make the United States more responsive to a rapidly changing world.

Critics of this bill have said that this is America turning inward, withdrawing from the rest of the world. In fact, however, this is America opening its eyes and squarely facing both our need to balance the budget and to respond to a very different and changing world. Our foreign affairs agencies were created during the cold war, when we had